"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—CHRIST.

The Christian Freeman.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL.

DEVOTED TO RELIGIOUS, MORAL, AND SOCIAL PROGRESS.

No. 9.] SEPTEMBER, 1859. [PRICE 1½d.

WHEAT OR TARES.

BY T. S. ARTHUR.

"WHEAT or tares—which are you sowing, Fanny, dear, in the mind of this little fellow?" said Uncle Lincoln to his niece, Mrs. Howard; and he lifted a child, not beyond his fourth summer, on his knee, and laid one of his hands amid the golden curls that fell about his neck and clustered on his snow-white shoulders.

"What a question, Uncle Lincoln!" replied Mrs. Howard. "It is the enemy that sows the tares, and I am his mother."

There was a glow of proud feeling in the countenance of Mrs. Howard as she said "I am his mother."

It was Mr. Lincoln's first visit to his niece since her marriage and removal to a city some hundred miles away from her old home.

"Even a mother's hand may sow tares," said the old gentleman. "I have seen it done many times. Not of design, but in thoughtless inattention to the quality of seed she held in her hand. The enemy mixes tares with wheat quite as often as he scatters evil seed. The husbandman must not only watch his fields by night and day, but also the repositories of his ground, lest the enemy cause him to sow tares as well as wheat, upon his own fruitful ground."

"Willie," said Mrs. Howard, speaking to her little boy about ten minutes afterwards, "don't upset my work-basket; stop, I say, you little rogue!"

Seeing that the wayward child did not mean to heed her words, the mother started forward, but not in time to prevent the spools of cotton, scissors, emery, cushion, etc., from being scattered about the floor.

Willie laughed in great glee at this exploit, while Mrs. Howard gathered up the contents of the work-basket, which she now placed on the shelf above the reach of her mischievous boy. Then she shook her finger at him in mock resentment, saying,—

"You little sinner! If you do that again I'll send you off with the milkman."

"Wheat or tares, Fanny?" Uncle Lincoln inquired, as he looked soberly at his niece.

"Neither," replied Mrs. Howard, smiling gayly.

"Tares," said Uncle Lincoln, emphatically.

"Nonsense, Uncle!"

"The tares of disobedience, Fanny. You have planted the seed, and it has already taken root. Nothing will choke out the wheat sooner. The tares of falsehood you also throw in upon the newly broken soil. What are you thinking about, my child?"

"The tares of falsehood, Uncle Lincoln! What are you thinking about?" said Mrs. Howard, in real surprise.

"Did you not say that you would send him off with the milkman if he did that again? I wonder if he believed you?"

"Of course he did not."

"Then," said Mr. Lincoln, "he has already discovered that his mother makes but light account of truth. Will his mother be surprised if he should grow up to set small value on his word?"

"You treat this matter too seriously, Uncle. He knows that I am only playing with him."

"He knows that you were telling him what is not true," replied Mr. Lincoln.

"I was only in sport," said Fanny persistently.

"But sporting with sharp-edged instruments is playing with deadly poisons." The old gentleman looked and spoke with the seriousness that oppressed his feeling. "Fanny! truth and obedience are good seed. Falsehood and disobedience are tares from the Evil One. Whatever you plant in the garden of your child will grow, and the harvest will be wheat or tares, just as you have sown."

Mrs. Howard did not reply, but her countenance took on a sober cast.

"Willie," said she, a few moments afterwards, "go down to Jane and tell her to bring me a glass of water."

Willie, who was amusing himself with some pictures, looked up on hearing his name, but as he did not feel to like going off to the kitchen, he made no response, and let his eyes turn to the pictures in which he had become interested.

"Willie!" Mrs. Howard spoke with decision, "did you hear me?"

"I don't want to go," answered Willie.

"Go, this minute!"

"I am afraid."

"Afraid of what?" inquired the mother.

"Afraid of the cat."

"No, you are not. The cat never hurt you or anybody else."

"I am afraid of the milkman. You said he would carry me off."

"The milkman is not down stairs," said Mrs. Howard, her face beginning to crimson; "he only comes in the morning."

"Yes, he is. I heard his wagon a little while ago, and he is talking with Jane now. Don't you hear him?" said the little fellow, with remarkable skill, having all the semblance of truth in his tone and expression.

Mrs. Howard did not look towards her Uncle: she was afraid to do that.

"Willie," the mother spoke very seriously, "you know that the milkman is not down stairs, and you know that you are not afraid of the cat. What you have said therefore is not true, and it is wicked to utter a falsehood,"

"Ho! ho!" laughed out the bright little fellow, evidently amused at his own sharpness, "then you are wicked, for you say that which is not true every day."

"Willie!"

"The milkman has not carried me off yet." There was a world of meaning in Willie's face. "You haven't whipped me for throwing my cap out of the window."

"Willie!" ejaculated the astonished mother.

"D'ye see that?" and the young rebel drew from his apron pocket a fine mosaic breast-pin, which he had positively been forbidden to touch, and held it up with a look of triumph and defiance.

"You little wretch!" exclaimed Mrs. Howard, "this is going too far;" and, springing towards her boy, she grappled him in her arms, and fled with her struggling burden from the room.

It was a quarter-of-an-hour before she returned alone to the apartment where she had left her Uncle. Her face was sober and her eyes betrayed recent weeping.

"Wheat or tares, Fanny?" asked the old gentleman, in earnest tones, as his niece came back.

"Tares," was the half mournful response.

"Wheat were better, Fanny."

"I see it, Uncle."

"And you will look in future to the seed in your hand, ere you scatter it upon the heart of your child?"

"God helping, I will, dear Uncle."

"Remember, Fanny, said Mr. Lincoln, "that truth and obedience are good seed. Plant them, and the harvest will come in blessings."

REVIVALISM.

THE "*Bulwark*," of August, has been sent us, with a few words marked for special attention; they are the following: "*A great many Arians have come under this influence* (the Revival influence in Ireland), *and they have at once abandoned their Arianism, and proclaimed their belief, and trust in Jesus as the Son of God.*" We call attention to this statement, first, to show our readers in what utter darkness many Trinitarians are as regards the belief of Arians or Unitarians regarding Christ. We all believe that Christ is the Son of God. The editor of the "*Bulwark*" speaks of the Revival

bringing a great many Arians to this belief. We see no conversion effected in this case. The Arians, in a peculiarly high sense, believe Jesus to be the Son of God. Let us learn from this how much need there is that we should labour, that the light of the truths in which we believe and rejoice, be diffused in our own land. Can we wonder that Unitarianism is dreaded, with the fact before us, that a large portion of our population regard us as not believing in God, and the majority of Church members of other denominations believe we discard Jesus Christ from our religious faith. The second point to which we ask attention is to Revivalism itself. It indicates a want of true religious life. Let no one of us feel apathetic on this subject. The great mass of the people have not yet been taught what true religion is. So it is that a number of well-meaning men—on the whole—meet together; they shout and sing; they wrestle and pray; they get warm; the room gets heated; the fresh air, in general, is excluded; the eternal gulf of punishment is, as it were, opened; simple-minded people become alarmed; a strong excitement is produced; violent mental agitation,—how to escape hell-fire fills the mind; conviction has come, and conversion must follow; meeting after meeting is held, and religion is sought, religion is looked upon as some particular impulse, something that can be caught, laid hold of; night after night the meetings are held; the right pitch of excitement is obtained; the impulse is felt; the soul is regarded as set free, converted, and, in some cases, this excitement has changed the life from undevoutness and immorality to a truly religious life—at least so we hope—although a devout Revivalist, whose life and energies have been very much spent in these meetings, and still, curious enough, engages in them, told us, a short time ago, it was very questionable that *any* good accrued from these Revival meetings at all. The evil of insanity, and after damp, we are assured, by many members of Orthodox churches, by far outbalances the good. We have two or three chapels before our minds, as we write, celebrated for the outpourings, seasons of refreshing, and revival excitements in times past, and they are the worst attended places of worship of which we know. If some gross immoralities are abandoned—as they are—and for which we rejoice, a great deal of evil speaking, religious conceit, and spiritual pride are engendered. These new converts can tell you the day, the hour, and the minute their souls were set free, and without you can tell a similar story, they whisper it about you are not converted, you are no Christian. They turn incessant talkers of what God has done for their souls; they lay their hands on their heart, look up to heaven, and become inflated with spiritual pride. We know, from our frequent intercourse with such people, we are writing simple matter-of-fact. Try to reason with those people; they will confound you about their *experience*, their *feelings*, the *time* and *place* they were *set free*. It is a dangerous mental condition when fancy and imagination get the upper hand of judgment. Dr. Priestly told the following curious occurrence, while he resided at Leeds, which illustrates the condition of conviction and conversion so nearly, we will repeat it. "A poor woman unfortunately imagined herself to be possessed by a devil, and having heard that Dr. Priestly was a great philosopher, who could perform miracles, she applied to him to take away the evil spirit that tormented her. The doctor attentively listened to her statement, and being aware of her delusion, with his usual mildness and benevolence, he endeavoured to convince her that she was labouring under a mistake. However all his efforts proved unavailing, for the poor creature still persisted that the act was as she stated; in order therefore to ease her mind, the doctor, good humouredly, told her to call upon him the next day, and in the meantime he would consider her case. Agreeably to his request the unhappy woman was punctual in her attendance, when the doctor, with a smile, informed her that he truly pitied her situation, but he hoped that he should be able to afford her some relief. His electrical apparatus being in readiness, with great gravity he desired the woman to stand upon the stool with glass legs, at the same time putting into her hand a brass chain, connected with

the conductor, and having charged her plentifully with electricity, he told her very seriously to take particular notice of what he did. He then took up a discharger, and applied it to her arm, when the escape of the electricity gave her a pretty strong shock. 'There!' shouted she, 'the devil's gone! I saw him go in that blue flame, and he gave me such a jerk as he went off; I have at last got rid of him, and am now quite comfortable.'" There is nothing which more nearly describes the state of feeling and expression of many of the converts of Revival movements than the foregoing. The world must be taught that the devil does not leave so precipitately, nor that godliness is caught so suddenly, as it were in a trap, at a Revival Meeting. The following are the views of three persons of the Trinitarian school of theology on "Revivals," and worthy of thoughtful perusal.

Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe says: "Revivals of religion have not been confined to Christian countries. Old heathenism had them. Popish Rome has them. Modern heathenism has them. One and all of these have had turns of unusual fervour in their way. One and all have had their trances, illuminations, and mysterious ecstacies. But those only are Christian Revivals which make men like Christ; or, if they do not make them like Him, at least set them on the road of trying to be like Him. We say therefore to our friends, that the period of a great religious impulse has come; that there will be Revivals all over the land, either false or true—either of a Christian or a heathen type—and by their fruits shall ye know them. We are glad to hear that some of the most effective Revival preachers confine their attention very much to preaching to the church. We are glad to hear that. It is quite necessary that those who profess to be the exponents of religion before the community should have some deeper and higher ideas of what religion is."

The Rev. Dr. Murray says: "The men who exhaust their sensation sermons, their anecdotes, and metaphors in two weeks, usually exhaust the real spirituality of the Church at the same time. I have known a great many Revival preachers in the Presbyterian Church. An accurate history of the most conspicuous of them would have its warning lessons for the future. One of them, at least, was sent to a State prison. Another was deposed from the ministry, and under an *alias* went to the west, where he died. Another was deposed from the Church, and died in a poor-house. And where there was piety at bottom, which prevented shipwreck of faith, they became imperious, defamers of their brethren, and, with scarcely an exception, have swerved from the faith, and become teachers of error. They have unsettled pastors—divided Churches—degraded, oftentimes, the pulpit by their vulgar phrases and illustrations, have sown broadcast the seeds of error, and have given rise to a religion of excitement, which is to the steady influence of Christian principle as is the scarlet flush of fever to the uniform glow of health. Some of them devoted their winters to getting up Revivals, and the other seasons of the year to some worldly pursuit. And they made more money through the winter than through the remainder of the year. One was an Evangelist through the winter, and spent the remainder of his time in cultivating a farm—another in selling a receipt for making a compost. The greater the excitement they could create, the greater the demand for their services; and it was said of one that he would labour for so much a head for all he would convert! One came into a little church, and, putting the pastor aside, said he would plough, sow, and reap that field in three weeks. He did so, and added nearly one hundred to its communicants. It has never recovered from the blow."

The Rev. G. Gilfillan on the Irish Revivals.—In a discourse on the text "Worship the Father in spirit and in truth," he said that, while granting the crying necessity of revival in the Church, he thought the more quietly the work was prosecuted the more likely it was to be permanent. He did not approve of incessant appeals to the base sentiment of fear, and thought that the threat of material fire and brimstone had now little effect, except to make the wicked gnash their teeth in defiance, and become more

hardened in their profligacy. He believed that no Revival could last, unless it were founded upon the basis of a broad Christianity, and upon the doctrine of the love of God in Christ. He characterised some of the Revivals of the past. George Whitfield, the most eloquent of men, made a profound impression at the time; but it was not lasting. He did not even succeed in founding a sect, and this was owing to the fact that he appealed principally to feeling, passion, and fear. He had seen something of the Dundee Revival of 1839, and believed it to have done good, but also to have done ill. It created in some an unhealthy excitement, and drove others to downright insanity. He had visited some people under its influence, and felt certain that they were more injured than benefited by it. As to the Irish Revival he had great doubts. The excesses of excitement; the cries, shrieks, groans uttered; people carried out of church in fits; some driven mad, and others hurried into extravagances of fierce and savage fanaticism; all tended to convince him that, let Dr. Cook, of Belfast, say what he pleased, it was hitherto as authentic a work of the devil as was ever transacted on this planet. There were, he understood, people who wished us to take a pattern from our Irish friends; but he would tell his people to be on their guard. Hitherto, in Dundee, the so-called Revival movement had been conducted with propriety and decorum. The lay preachers were, he believed, good men, and were doing good; but he had no great faith in large public meetings of a Revival cast; no belief that Revivals could be pumped up by any mechanical means, and thought that people would improve in religious matters better by reading their Bibles, cultivating their minds by varied useful reading, and instructing their children and households, than by seeking after unusual and morbid means of excitement. "Times of refreshing," he had no doubt, of the true kind, would come—and, by the power of new truth communicated, as well as of deep religious emotion excited, would prepare the world in some measure for the strange and awful times which were manifestly at hand.

MY PHILOSOPHY.

Bright things can never die,
E'en though they fade;
Beauty and minstrelsy
Deathless were made:
What though the summer day
Passes at eve away?
Does not the moon's soft ray
Silence the night?
Bright things can never die,
Saith my philosophy:
Phœbus, though he pass by,
Leaves us the light.

Kind words can never die,
Cherished and blest:
God knows how deep they lie
Stored in the breast,
Like childhood's simple rhymes,
Said o'er a thousand times,
Aye, in all years and climes,
Distant and near.
Kind words can never die,
Saith my philosophy:
Deep in the soul they lie,
God knows how dear.

Childhood can never die;
Wrecks of the past
Float on the memory
E'en to the last;
Many a happy thing,
Many a daisied spring
Flows on time's ceaseless wing,
Far, far away.
Childhood can never die,
Saith my philosophy:
Wrecks of our infancy
Live on for aye.

Sweet fancies never die;
They leave behind
Some fairy legacy
Stored in the mind—
Some happy thought or dream,
Pure as day's earliest beam,
Kissing the gentle stream
In the lone glade;
Yet, though those things pass by,
Saith my philosophy,
Bright things can never die,
E'en though they fade.

UNITARIANISM IN AMERICA.

It was in that memorable year, when two large and hostile armies, after a long war, decided on the Plains of Waterloo that Europe should have a long and useful peace; yes, it was in 1815 that the religious communities of America drew their line of demarcation and divided their Christendom into two distinct camps, Trinitarian and Unitarian; and from that time ceased to change pulpits and hold religious fellowship with one another. True enough, anti-Trinitarian sentiments had been avowed for a few years before that time, but up to that year Baptists, Presbyterians, and Independents, including a great number of Unitarians—though not so denominated—had wrought together. The separation came; the Trinitarians broke fellowship, and, since, Unitarianism in America has made most amazing progress. Before that time there were a few anti-Trinitarian Churches, avowedly so. There was in 1787 one in Boston, presided over by the Rev. James Freeman. This is generally called the first Unitarian Church in America. There is evidence that a few ministers in different parts held Unitarian sentiments before 1787. From 1815 we date a united congregational effort, assuming the name and principles of Unitarians; and we are led to remark it is a most astonishing feature of our cause in America, that it has spread with amazing rapidity, for in about forty years it has grown in dimensions—the four denominations unitedly—to be equal to the Methodist Churches of America. Every one admits that, during the last hundred years, the progress of Methodism has been marvellously rapid, and not less but more so in America than in any part of the world; and yet, in a joint course of Lectures with Methodists and others, delivered last year in Boston, the Rev. Orville Dewy, used these very words:—"*That our three denominations* (Unitarians) *together may not be less than the Methodist body itself.*" There are some persons so utterly blind to the progress of our principles that they say we make *no* progress; if they were to say that Methodism had made no progress during one hundred years, they would be regarded as insane or insincere; yet, Unitarianism in America, can measure its strength in numbers with the Methodist body itself. The Methodists are of one hundred years growth, while the Unitarian denominations are only about half that age. Boston, the Athens of the United States, can boast of nearly thirty distinctly called Unitarian Churches—and, altogether, of the four denominations—Unitarians, Universalists, Christians, and Hicksites, of about forty Churches. We wish, in this place, to add we never measure our Christianity by success; those who are Christians of one sect or another, because of the majority being that way; for we know people foolish enough to think after this fashion—such people would be *Catholics* in Rome, *Protestants* in London, and *Unitarians* in Boston.

Among the leading names in the campaign of pure and undefiled religion in its sentiments and life in America, we have Channing, Worcester, Norton, and Ware. In the year 1825 the American Unitarian Association was formed. The following are the stated objects of the Association. (1.)—"To collect and diffuse information respecting the state of Unitarian Christianity in our country. (2). To produce union, sympathy, and co-operation among liberal Christians. (3.) To publish and distribute books and tracts, inculcating correct views of religion, in such form and at such price as shall afford all an opportunity of being acquainted with Christian truth. (4.) To supply Missionaries, especially in such parts of our country as are destitute of a stated ministry. (5.) To adopt whatever other measure may hereafter seem expedient, such as contributions in behalf of clergymen with insufficient salaries, or in aid of building Churches." And about twenty years after the formation of the Association, the following statistical report of Unitarians appeared in one of their papers. (1.) That the number of Churches regularly organized were 240; in an incipient state, 60; the average attendance on Sunday, 75,000; the whole number of persons, adults and children, 300,000; communicants, 18,000; Sunday scholars, 27,000; teachers, 4,800. In last year's American *Unitarian Almanac*, 1858, we

find the names of about 300 Unitarian ministers, with the following remark:—"From the improved condition of the Theological Schools at Meadville, and at Cambridge, hopes are entertained that preachers may soon be supplied to many growing cities at the West, already asking for such ministration. Surveying our general condition, and comparing it with that of other ecclesiastical bodies, we see no reason to doubt that we maintain our position as firmly and as hopefully as any denomination of Christians."

Throughout the States there are *ten* "ministerial denominations," which enable the ministers of different States to meet together for consultation and co-operation. The following is the list of periodicals published in the Unitarian denomination in America. "The Christian Examiner," "The Christian Register," "The Christian Inquirer," "The Quarterly Journal of the American Unitarian Association," "The Sunday School Gazette," "The Liberal Christian," "The Monthly Religious Magazine and Independent Journal." There are also *thirty-seven* different Associations for Missionary and book and tract and charitable and literary purposes.

We have already referred to Meadville and Cambridge Unitarian Theological School. HARVARD UNIVERSITY, at Cambridge, in Massachusetts, is the oldest and best College in the country, and here the Unitarians have the most considerable influence. The Charter of the College is quite unsectarian. No sectarian test is demanded; knowledge, piety, and godliness is the basis of this Institution, and the instruction is principally in the hands of Unitarians. It is the largest and best educational Institution in the State for every branch of knowledge. The donations to this College have been numerous and liberal; it is rich in funds. The Library contains upwards of 60,000 volumes of books, and the students, at times, number between six and seven hundred. Ministers of all denominations have received their education at Harvard, and the greatest statesmen, too; yet, from its nonsectarian character, it is principally in the hands of Professors, who faithfully perform their duty, without reference to creed or party. We rejoice to find that our brethren across the Atlantic sustain the highest character for justice and goodness. The "*New Englander*," a Trinitarian journal, says: "We give them (Unitarians) the highest praise for the estimate in which they hold the graceful amenities and the sweeter charities of social intercourse. We give them the highest praise for insisting on kindness to all as the only spirit which a Christian should cherish; courtesy as the only external robe which he should wear; and good works as the only results that should follow in the path in which he treads. We admire the high spirit of honour, the delicate sense of propriety, the stern commercial integrity, which are fostered and exhibited by so many who are trained under the influences of liberal Christianity. The intellectual spirit, the elevation above the vulgar gentility of mere wealth, which are diffused through many—not all—of its social circles; the truthfulness to nature in manners and taste; the high appreciation of moral and intellectual Institutions; the public spirit which so lavishly provides for them; and, above all, the strict and careful conscientiousness which train and mould many an esteemed and honourable friend, are virtues of no mean value, and are not the chance growth of nature. They show culture, intellectual, social, and moral, of the highest order. *But these, in themselves, are not religion*, etc." We pray that we, in England, may merit a similar character, and we can easily stand the shock of being regarded as *not* religious.

We also joy in the position our churches and ministers, in general, assume towards Slavery in the United States. After the passing of the Fugitive Slave law, a strong protest against Slavery was signed by a large majority of the Unitarian ministers of the States. A part of the protest goes on to say:—"We solemnly protest against the system of Slavery as un-Christian and inhuman. (1.) Because it violates the law of right. (2.) Because it outrages the law of love. (3.) Because it degrades the soul of the slave. (4.) Because it defiles the soul of the master. (5.) Because it prevents education, moral and religious. (6.) Because it

sears the popular conscience and destroys public virtue." The protest concludes with a solemn pledge that the subscribers "will never be weary of labouring in the cause of human rights and freedom, till Slavery be abolished and every slave made free." Few are the exceptions to Unitarian churches or ministers who are not opposed to Slavery, though they do not all agree in their course of action as to the best means for overthrowing Slavery. Here, wise, and good, and true men may certainly differ. Our Church in America lifts its voice against Slavery, and is the friend of universal human freedom.

It is well known in America that many of the leading authors, poets, philosophers, statesmen, and divines, are Unitarians. The foremost philanthropist of the age, following in the steps of the benevolent Howard, is a Unitarian lady, Miss Dix, of America. The first "*Peace Society*" in the world owed its origin to the Rev. Dr. Worcester, a Unitarian minister of America. The Rev. Dr. Tuckerman, one of the New England Unitarian ministers, was the founder of Domestic Missions; and the first Sunday School established in Boston—probably the first in New England—was commenced by a Unitarian lady, Miss Lydia K. Adams. We are united in the bonds of the same Church faith to the leading philanthropists and reformers of the age: may we all possess the same Christian and self-sacrificing spirit, or this will avail us nothing.

During the last year or two an effort has been made by the American Unitarian Association to more greatly extend their literature, to make it cheap, and have it carried to the homes of the poor. We are glad to note their appeal for funds has been liberally responded to, and about 20,000 dollars have been subscribed for this purpose. They are now issuing in cheap volumes their valuable and standard literature. Their weekly and monthly periodicals are most interesting publications, containing much sound and pleasing instruction for both young and old. Dr. Beard, of Manchester, is now supplying our own land with the best of the American publications at a cheap rate. These books, wherever they go, will exercise a powerful influence for good; and we hope they will have an immense circulation in our own country as well as in America. We have remarked in this article chiefly on those who are called by the name of "*Unitarian*" in America: our next paper will be devoted to the *Universalists*, *Christians*, and *Hicksites*, Societies, all of which are Unitarians, and who far out number the Societies called "Unitarian." We conclude our present paper by a quotation from Sir Charles Lyell's "Travels in America." Sir Charles not being a Unitarian, this may be read with some interest.

"The prominent position occupied by the Unitarians arises, not from their number, nor their wealth, however considerable this may be, but from their talent, earnestness, and knowledge. Many of the leading minds in the Union belong to this sect, and among them, Channing, Sparks, Dewey, and other well-known authors, have been converts from the Congregationalists. To have no creed, no standard to rally round, no fixed canons of interpretation of Scripture, is said to be fatal to their progress. Yet one of their body remarked to me that they might be well satisfied that they were gaining ground, when it could be said that in the last thirty years (since 1815) the number of their ministers had increased in a tenfold ratio, or from fifty to five hundred, whereas the population had only doubled in twenty-five years. He also reminded me that their ranks are scarcely ever recruited from foreign emigrants, from whom the Romanists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, and Episcopalians annually draw large accessions. A more kindly feeling has of late years sprung up between the Unitarians and Congregationalists, because some of the most eminent writers of both sects have joined in defending themselves against a common adversary, namely, those rationalists who go so far as to deny the historical evidence of the miracles related in the New Testament, and who, in some other points, depart more widely from the Unitarian standard, than does the latter from that of Rome itself. Norton, author of 'The Genuineness of the Gospels,' may be mentioned, as one of the celebrated Unitarian divines who has extorted from the more liberal members of all 'orthodox' denominations

the praise of being a defender of the faith. In the course of my two visits to the United States, I enjoyed opportunities of hearing sermons preached by many of the most eminent Unitarians,—among them were Channing, Henry Ware, Dewey, Bellows, Putnam, and Gannet,—and was much struck, not only with their good sense and erudition, but with the fervour of their eloquence. I had been given to understand that I should find a want of warmth in their discourses; that they were too cold and philosophical, and wanting in devotional feeling; but, on the contrary, there were many of them most impressive, full of earnestness and zeal, as well as of original views and instruction. One of the chief characteristics was the rare allusion made to the Old Testament, or to controverted points of doctrine, or to the mysteries of the Christian religion, and the frequency with which they dwelt on the moral precepts and practical lessons of the Gospels, especially the preaching of Christ himself. Occasional exhortations to the faithful, cheerfully to endure obloquy for the sake of truth, and to pay no court to popularity, an undue craving for which was, they said, the bane of a democracy, convinced me how much the idea of their standing in a hostile position to a large numerical majority of the community was present to their minds. On some occasions, however, reference was naturally made to doctrinal points, particularly to the humanity of Christ, his kindred nature, and its distinctness from that of the eternal, omnipotent, and incorporeal Spirit which framed the universe; but chiefly on occasions when the orator was desirous of awakening in the hearts of his hearers emotions of tenderness, pity, gratitude, and love, by dwelling on the bodily sufferings of the Redeemer on the cross. More than once have I seen these appeals produce so deep a sensation, as to move a highly educated audience to tears; and I came away assured that they who imagine this form of Christianity to be essentially cold, lifeless, and incapable of reaching the heart, can never have enjoyed opportunities of listening to their most gifted preachers, or had a large personal intercourse with the members of the sect."

THE DYING NEVER WEEP.

We were recently called to the death-bed of a young man of great promise. In an account of the young man's last hours, we allude to a fact which must have forced itself upon the notice of every one who has been often summoned to the presence of a departing spirit, where correct views of death and the future are entertained: "It is a striking fact—*the dying never weep.* The circle of sobbing, agonized hearts around produces not one tear. Is it that he is insensible and stiff already in the chill of dissolution? That cannot be; for he asks for his father's hand, as if to gain strength in the mortal struggle, and leans on the breast of mother, brother, or sister, with still conscious affection; and just before expiring, at eve, after a long day's converse with the Angel of Summons, he says to his oldest brother —the last audible good-night of earth— 'Kiss me, kiss me!' It must be because the dying have reached a point too deep for our earthly crying and weeping. They are face to face with higher and holier beings, with the Father in heaven, and his angel throng, led on by the Son himself; and what are griefs of a morning, tears of a dying farewell—be it that they are shed by the dearest on earth—in that vision bright of immortal life and everlasting reunion!"

'Tis said the dying never weep;
Is it because the chill of death
Insensate makes them to this earth,
With every parting breath?
It cannot be—they call for friends,
Ask by a father to be prest,
And long to lay the drooping brow
Upon a mother's breast.

Why do the dying never weep?
Oh, they have reached their point of Time
That is for aught like earthly tears
Too wondrous, too sublime;
Their spirit-eyes new beings mark;
And on their ears the Future's sea
Already through the shadows waft
The voices of Eternity!

Oh! say, why should the dying weep?
Weep with such angel-throngs around!
Weep when their brows shall be so soon
With the Immortal crowned!
It is the living that should weep,
The living yet to bear their chains—
But not the dying, with that call
To God's eternal plains!

Christian Inquirer.

LOST! LOST!

A LESSON FOR OUR CHILDREN.

O DEAR! my gloves, my tippet, and my Latin Reader—I can't find one of them! I dare say Georgie has hid them, out of mischief, or Lucy has put them in some out-of-the-way place, or—"

"Or some careless little girl has mislaid them herself," interposed a pleasant voice.

"I know I am careless, mamma. But this time I am certain I left them on the hall table, when I came from school."

"Quite sure—positive, my dear?"

"Yes, indeed—that is, *almost*. Oh, now I remember—I went to the closet to get some water. Perhaps—I might—yes, here they are! Well, if I *am* careless, I always drive through somehow, and I should rather be as I am, then like Agnes Grey. *Such* a particular little *fuss!* Her old-maidishness is really annoying." And with an air of some self-satisfaction, Jeannie Barnes put on her tippet and gloves, and snatching up her bag, was on the point of starting off, when she was recalled by her mother.

"As I thought—morning slippers on, bonnet bent, no collar, and probably unbrushed teeth. Oh! Jeannie!"

This was said in a voice of sadness, which would have touched Jeannie's heart, only she was in such a hurry she had no time to think or feel. So up stairs she tore to finish her toilet, leaving her bonnet with her mother, and when she came down she only said, "I am afraid I shall be late," and had slammed the outer door behind her, before her mother was fully aware that the unfortunate bonnet had been snatched from her hand.

In the afternoon, Mrs. Barnes proposed a walk to Jeannie. The social ramble was joyfully assented to. Carrying a small basket, the little girl walked beside her mother quite soberly.

"A visit of charity, I suppose, mamma?" as they entered a narrow street.

"Yes, my dear, partly."

"Oh, what a dirty-looking place! Are you going here?" said Jeannie, following her mother up two flights of stairs, and into a room in the third story of the dingy old brick-building they had entered.

What a scene of dirt, confusion, and discomfort! The floor, bed-clothes, and garments hanging around the room vied with each other in grease, soot, and grime. A puny baby, the original colour of whose skin and garments could not possibly be discovered, was rocked in the arms of a dirtier mother, while a low wail came from the cradle at her feet, occupied by a sick child of two years. A dresser was garnished with unwashed dishes. Over the edge of an open meal chest hung a dirty stocking, while a boy's greasy hat comfortably rested upon the contents. A little girl of ten was rubbing at a washing-board, in water it was hard to believe ever was pure, while the rickety table beside her was filled with promiscous articles for the wash, and the remains of a late breakfast.

Mrs. Barnes inquired for the sick child, and produced some nourishing food for him, from the basket Jeannie had carried. Then she said kindly to the woman, "You have not been able to put your room in order yet?"

"No, ma'am, I have'nt; Jack's been so sick, and baby is so fretty, and when *he* comes home—well, well, you know how it is."

"Yes, I do, and I am sorry for you, Mrs. Jones. But don't you think it would make some difference with your husband if he had a more cheerful home to come to?"

"May be; but I'm about tired. Seems to me there's no chance now for much peace no how; too late to begin now."

"Never too late, if you would; only be persuaded to try it. Even now you *could* change your mode of life. It would be harder for you than to have learned to be neat when a girl, but it could be done."

Mrs. Jones shaking her head and seeming indisposed to talk, Mrs. Barnes left her.

As Jeannie went out of the room, she saw, peeping out of a small cupboard, a ragged boy of six, whose attention seemed divided between the visitors and a molasses jug, to the contents of which he was helping himself, by means of a rag alternately inserted and drawn out.

During the process, clothes, face, and hands shared the sweetness with his mouth. This was almost too much for Jeannie's equanimity; and as they quitted the room she said to her mother, with a shudder of disgust, "How can you bear to go to such places?"

"Should you like to know this woman's early history, Jeannie? She was once a bright, pretty girl, with but one serious fault."

"I should like to hear about her, if she was ever tidy and clean."

"Ah, there is all the trouble; that was always her fault. She lived in my mother's family, and was kindly cared for; but she was a careless child, always doing things in a helter-skelter manner—always *driving*, as you call it; consequently her work was never done properly, or if done once, was undone by her own heedlessness. It did little good to talk to her; she always said she liked to see things all in a heap about her, and then she could *drive through* them. I am not sure she did not entertain a contempt for orderly, or, as you call them, *fussy* people."

"Oh, mamma, I see now what you mean. As if I should ever come to be like her! How can you think it?"

"My dear child, I do *not* think you could ever be just like Mrs. Jones. But you may, and undoubtedly will, be as careless a woman as you are a girl, if you do not think your fault serious enough to need correction. That is the chief trouble with you, as it was with Mrs. Jones when a child; you do not consider that heedless, slatternly ways in youth lead to neglect of positive duties in mature life. Nay, careless habits lead to the overthrow of all prospects of domestic happiness; for I never yet saw a happy family which was a disorderly one. Even now, my child, you know not the pain, the anxiety you are giving me by this one obstinate fault. I am sure you are not aware how unjust it makes you to others, and how much precious time it causes you to waste."

"Unjust to others! How is that, mamma?"

"Whom did you blame this morning for the loss of your possessions?"

"Oh, I remember. But then how did I waste time, pray? I was not late."

"Perhaps not; yet you must have gone to school on the run, a practice I do not like; and the time spent in hunting for your missing articles would have been more than sufficient for you to have done the little kindness Lucy asked of you—Lucy, always so obliging to you."

"I see, mamma; I am very sorry."

"I once met a poor crazy woman, whose constant cry was, 'Lost! lost!' I asked a friend, who knew her history, what it meant. She said her happiness in life had been wrecked by the omission of some plain duties which devolved upon her in early youth. She was taken down with brain fever, which left her insane, and these words were ever on her lips, accompanied with agonizing gestures. Sooner or later lost opportunities rise before us in reproof of past neglect, and the sad refrain of our hearts, if not our lips, will be, 'Lost! lost!' Lost, the opportunity to gladden and cheer the hearts of fond parents—lost, the opportunity to attend to the happiness of brother, sister, or faithful friend—lost, that precious time God gives us to use, and not abuse—and perhaps, later in life, lost the serene joys of a well-ordered, peaceful family circle."

"Please don't say another word, mamma. It is enough. I never thought! I see now, and I will begin at once to do better."

"I do not doubt you will succeed if you try. Begin in the right earnest spirit, and seek aid from the Father, whose ear is ever open to the wants of his youngest and weakest children. And I trust at the close of another year, if you have occasion to use these sad words, it will be in a glad and not a remorseful spirit, and that you can say that only this bad habit, now so troublesome and dangerous, is 'Lost! lost!'"—*Child's Friend.*

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THE SUNDAY SCHOLAR'S CATECHISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, with Poetical selections, by the Rev. D. Griffith.—Price 6d., or Twenty-five copies for 10s.—Whitfield, Strand, London.

THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF THE WORSHIP OF GOD, by the Rev. Wm. Mc. Kean.—Price 1d. each.—Whitfield, Strand, London.

THE HOLY SPIRIT, ITS NATURE AND WORK, a Sermon preached before the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, by the Rev. John Montgomery.—H. Greer, Bookseller, Belfast.

EXPLANATIONS OF SCRIPTURAL TEXTS ADVANCED TO SUSTAIN UNSCRIPTURAL DOCTRINES.

DEITY OF CHRIST.

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves . . . to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."—Acts xx. 28.

It is admitted by most eminent Trinitarian scholars that the true reading of this passage ought to be "The Church of the Lord." "The reading, '*Church of the Lord*,' has been received by *Griesbach*, *Grotius*, *Le Clerc*, *Wetstein*, and almost all eminent critics of the age."—*Kuinoel.*

"The reading, 'the church of God,' has hitherto been found in but few manuscripts; and, among those, none is of high or even of considerable antiquity."—*Bishop Middleton.*

"Of manuscripts, all the most ancient and the most valuable . . . I must acknowledge that to me the preponderance of evidence appears in favour of the reading, '*The Church of the Lord.*'"—Dr. J. P. Smith.

"Whose are the fathers; and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen."—Rom. ix. 5.

It is confidently affirmed by Trinitarians that this text is decisive proof of the deity of Christ; but *Erasmus*, a learned Trinitarian, did not think so, all depends on the pointing of the passage, and so he remarks—"This passage may be pointed and rendered in three different ways: *First*, "Of whom, according to the flesh, is Christ, who is over all. God be blessed for ever."—*Second*, "Of whom, according to the flesh, is Christ, who, being God over all, is blessed for ever;" and, *Third*, which is perfectly suitable to the purport of the discourse, "Of whom is Christ according to the flesh;" finishing the sentence here, and subjoining what follows—"God who is over all be blessed for ever"—as an ascription of praise for our having received the law, the covenant, and the prophecies; and, lastly, Christ sent in human nature, privileges which God, by his unspeakable counsels, had bestowed for the redemption of mankind." *Erasmus* goes on to remark, "Those therefore who contend that in this text Christ is clearly termed *God*, either place little confidence in other passages of Scriptures,—deny all understanding to the Arians,—or pay scarcely any attention to the style of the Apostle. A similar passage occurs in 2 Cor. xi. 31: "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for ever;" the latter clause being undeniably restricted to the Father. If, however, the *Church* teaches that Rom. ix. 5 must be interpreted of the Deity of the Son, the Church must be obeyed—though this is not sufficient to convince heretics, or those who will listen only to the words of Sacred Writ: but, if she were to say that the passage cannot be otherwise explained in conformity with the Greek, she would assert what is confuted by the thing itself." The reader may thus perceive that Unitarians have Trinitarian company, and not Erasmus alone, either, in rendering the last clause as a doxology—"*God be blessed for ever. Amen.*" It may be said, that this is inserting the word (*be*) which is not in the text: we reply, our translators have done so in other places of the New Testament, and ought to have done so here. They have done so in 2 Cor. i. 3—"Blessed *be* God, etc."—the word (*be*) is a supplied word. They have done so in Eph. i. 3—"Blessed *be* the God and Father, etc." The word *be* is also here, and in other places a supplied word. Supposing that Unitarians concede Jesus Christ is called God in this text, it does not follow that he is the Supreme God. "*God over all*" may have reference only to the several subjects premised in the preceding members of the passage. *Dr. Macknight*, a Trinitarian, thus understands this title: he says, "It need not surprise us, that Christ in the flesh is called God over all blessed for ever, since God hath highly exalted him in the human nature, and given him a name above every name, and hath put all things under his feet, and will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained." This clearly shows whatever name or power Jesus Christ may possess, he has received from God, who hath given him power and a name above every name. This text does not teach that "Christ is God over all blessed for ever." We think there is even more reason to believe that it teaches "Christ, who is over all, is blessed of God for ever." We once asked a man of humble attainments, a plain working-man, how he understood this text, and he gave the following answer, which is more in accordance with the spirit of the Bible than the Trinitarian expositions in general. He said "he regarded the Apostle Paul asking, in the fourth and fifth verses, the questions Who are the *Israelites?* to whom pertaineth the *adoption*, and the *glory*, and the *covenants*, and the giving of the *law*, and the *service of God*, and the *promises?* Whose are the fathers? and of whom as concerning the flesh, Christ came? And the last clause he regarded in the same light as a question, a very common method of St. Paul in his epistles, asking a question and giving the answer. He asks, 'Who is over all;' that is, over the *Israelites*, *adoption*, *glory*, *covenants*, *law*, *service of God*, *promises*, *fathers*, and *Christ*. And he answers *God*, that is to say, God is over all blessed for ever. Amen." This is certainly true; and it may be that this is the meaning of the passage. This is in harmony with the spirit of Paul's epistles. The Trinitarian explanation is not borne out by the text, and is very contrary to the tenor of the Scriptures.

"And, without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."—1 Tim. iii. 16.

Some persons lay great stress on this passage, and especially as the word mystery is introduced. The word mystery in the New Testament does not mean something above our comprehension,

but simply something revealed that previously was hidden. Unitarians find nothing in this text to shake their belief that "Christ is a *man* approved of God." They believe also that God was manifest in Jesus Christ. They believe with Paul also that God is manifest in the works of creation, and with Pope, God

"Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
Glows in the stars and blossoms in the trees."

And with another Poet they believe, God,

"Spake by the prophets, by the Saviour taught,
And warmed and brightened in the deeds he wrought."

This text no more proves Christ to be God, than the 19th Psalm proves the *heavens* and the *firmament* to be God, which declare his glory and show his handywork; that is, they manifest God. We all believe that Jesus Christ was a divine manifestation among men. A revision of the Bible will prove a great calamity to many proof texts for the deity of Christ; it will do so in this case; for Sir Isaac Newton has proved, beyond doubt, that *all* the churches for the first four or five hundred years, and the authors of *all* the ancient versions, read this passage thus: "Great is the mystery of godliness, *which* (not God) was manifest in the flesh; and that the insertion of the word God is a corruption of later times. *Bishop Marsh* says, "This reading (God manifest) is found, at first hand, in not a single ancient manuscript in uncial letters, nor in a single ancient version, except the Arabic, which is of very doubtful authority."

"But unto the Son, he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness, etc."—Heb. i. 8.

The next verse most clearly shows that Jesus Christ, whatever titles may be given to him, is not the supreme God. It reads: "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore GOD, even THY GOD, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." This text is supposed to call Christ *God*; thus it is inferred that he is the Supreme God. We should not forget that the Scriptures teach that GOD hath *given* him a name above every name; and that the appellation, *God*, was applied to Solomon, to Divine Messengers, and to Magistrates and others. *Dr. Olinthus Gregory* snarls at the Unitarians for attempting to change the form of this sentence into "*God is thy throne for ever and ever.*" He treats them as if they had neither precedent nor reason for so doing; here you shall find both precedent and reason in the very words and translations of Trinitarians for so doing. *Coverdale's* Bible reads: "But unto the Son he saith, God, thy seat endureth for ever." *Wicklif's* Bible has it: "But to the Son he saith, God, thy throne is unto the world of worlds." *Tyndal's* Bible reads: "God, thy seat shall be for ever and ever." *Erasmus* says: "It is uncertain which of the following renderings gives the true sense—'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;' or, 'God himself is thy throne for ever and ever'—for the Greek expression is ambiguous." *Dr. Wm. Sherlock* and *Professor Hill* both admit that it may be justly rendered, "*God is thy throne.*" *Grotius* says: "The sense of this passage therefore is, *God himself is thy perpetual seat;* that is, if we have respect to Solomon, 'As a throne holds men undisturbed, so will God always support thee in thy kingdom;' but, if to Christ, the meaning is 'God will uphold thee in thy kingdom for ever and ever.'" These explanations (of Trinitarians) entirely destroy it as a proof text for the deity of Christ, and are accordant with Unitarian expositions.

"Hereby perceive we the love *of God*, because he laid down his life for us."—1 John iii. 16.

The reader will see by looking at the text in the authorised version that the words *(of God)* are in italic, which show they are supplied by the translators, and not in the original, and have led many to believe that God laid down his life, a thing as inconsistent with reason, revelation, and common sense, as anything could be, that an infinite and immortal being could be deprived of life by his dependant creatures. Surely we need a revision of the Scriptures, that the English reader may not be led astray by the many unwarrantable insertions of our translators.

"And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. *This is the true God*, and eternal life."—1 John v. 20.

This is regarded by the Swedenborgian, and also many Trinitarians as conclusive evidence that Christ is the true God. This very text affirms that Jesus Christ is the *Son* of God; twice, it says, He is the *Son of God.* And Christ the Son of God prays (John xvii. 3), and there informs us who is the *true God*, "That they might know thee" (that is, the Father) "THE ONLY TRUE GOD." In the face of this we wonder how any Christian dare regard the Father of Jesus Christ in any other light than the ONLY true God. The pronoun (*this*) does not, from the very sense of this text, and the whole current of New Testament teaching, refer to Jesus Christ, but to HIM whom Christ hath revealed unto us, "*Him that is true,*" of whom Jesus Christ is the *true witness* of THE TRUE GOD, whom to know is eternal life. It is sometimes contended that the pronoun *this* refers only to the preceding noun, but this is a mistake, as we will show from one or two passages. In John's Gospel, vi. 48—50, "*I* am the *bread of life.* Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead. *This* is the bread which cometh down from heaven." It is very clear that the word *this* refers not to the fathers but to Christ, as the antecedent. Again, Acts iv. 10—11, "By the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. *This* is the stone which was set at nought of you builders." It is very clear *this* refers not to the nearest antecedent, the restored man, but to Jesus Christ. Again, ii. John 7, the very next chapter to the passage at issue, we find: "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus

Christ is come in the flesh." *This* is a deceiver and an antichrist. No Christian would say that *this* refers to the nearest noun in this text. There is no reason for believing that *this*, in the passage under examination, refers to Jesus Christ, but every reason for believing it refers to the God and Father of Jesus Christ, THE ONLY TRUE GOD. The following are the concessions of Trinitarians on this passage. "The Father is the true God, and eternal life, the Fountain of all"—*Erasmus*. "*This is the true God*, namely, He, and none else whom Jesus hath declared to be the object of worship. The pronoun *this* not unfrequently relates to a remote antecedent. The Apostle means that God is the primary and chief author of eternal life. So also Christ is called life, because next to God the Father, he is the cause of eternal life."—*Grotius*. "*This* (with whom we are united with his Son) is the true God and the author of eternal happiness. . . . . Not only the Photinians, but also many of the orthodox, refer these words, not to the proximate, but to the more remote antecedent, namely, to God the Father; and rightly, for, in the beginning of the verse, the Father is distinguished from the Son."—*Rosenmuller*. "The untenableness of the arguments for the orthodox reference of *this*, to Christ, at once renders the opposite interpretation (that is, of Unitarians) more probable." And then the writer, *Dr. Lucke* (who was a strictly orthodox Lutheran interpreter), goes on to say: "But the probability is rendered a certainty by the following considerations" (four reasons he gives and concludes). These are sufficient grounds for declaring that the only right construction is to refer *this* to God; that is, to God the Father and not Jesus Christ his Son.

The passages in which Christ is alleged to be called *God*, we have now concluded. The quotations conceding the justness of Unitarian interpretation of these passages, are the concessions of eminent Trinitarians: let this be kept in mind. We now proceed with another class of texts.

"The light of the glorious gospel of Christ who is the image of God."—2 Cor. iv. 4. "Who is the image of the invisible God."—Col. i. 15. "Who being the brightness of his glory and the *express image of his person*."—Heb. i. 3.

We think no class of texts more clearly subvert the deity of Christ than this, because an image is a different thing from that which it is the likeness. Adam was made in the image of God, nothing more plainly can teach us that Adam is therefore not God. Man is in the image of God, of the invisible God, we can therefore justly say man is not God. Christ is in the image of God, and therefore, from this very fact, as an image is always a different thing from that which it represents, Christ is not God. *Calvin* says: "The phrase, *image of the invisible God*, applied to Christ, is to be understood, not so much of his co-essentiality with the Father as his relation to us in being the Father's representative. . . . I mention this, because ancient writers, carried away by their zeal against the Arians, made more of this passage than was right." Again, *Calvin* says: "Chrysostom laid the greatest stress on the word *image*, by contending that a creature cannot be called the image of the Creator; but this is a very feeble argument, and is refuted by Paul himself, who says, that 'man is the image and glory of God.'" —1 Cor. xi. 7.

"Who, being in the *form of God*, thought it not robbery to be *equal with God*."—Phil. ii. 6.

We think the phrase, *in the form of God*, should never be used as a proof, for it is manifestly against the doctrine, as to be in the *form*, *figure*, or *image* of a person, at once does impress us he is not that person. The same idea starts in the mind when we hear the phrase *equal with God*. If Christ were God, it is unmeaning language to talk of him being equal with God, for we never speak of any man or anything being equal only to itself. But as this passage is so often quoted, we will add a few more words. There is abundant reason to believe it is a mistranslation, although, as it stands, the weight of its evidence on reflection is against the deity of Christ; that is, being in the *form of God*, and *equal with God*, are both incompatible with his being God. The Apostle, in this place, is teaching the duty of humility, and says to them, that Christ, who was in the form of God, or like God, was God's representative among men, did not desire to appear as God, or as equal with God. *Thought it not robbery to be equal with God.*—This phrase is not warranted by the original, and is opposed to the scope of the Apostle's reasoning. The following admissions of those who have contended earnestly for the deity of Christ ought to satisfy. *Bishop Sherlock* reads it: "Was not fond or tenacious of appearing as God; did not eagerly insist to be equal with God." *Principal Hill* renders it: "Was not tenacious of this equality with God; did not consider it as a thing to be eagerly grasped." *Professor Stuart* says: "He regarded not the being equal with God as a thing to be coveted." *Dr. J. Pye Smith* renders it: "Did not esteem it an object to be caught at; to be on a parity with God." These translations of men so very eminent in the defence of the deity of Christ, ought to be allowed by every Trinitarian; and thus this famous passage disappears from the proof texts. "Christ in the form of God did not think it right to appear as God." He was *humble*, *meek*, of a *lowly heart*, and the Apostle urges his example on Christians. We subjoin the following concessions. "The Apostle speaks of Christ as man. . . . He did not usurp to himself equality with God, but 'humbled himself.'" . . . . What is here rendered, *He did not think it robbery*, etc., AMBROSE explains, "*He did not assert, or arrogate to himself equality with God;* so that he might show us an example of humility, but subjected himself, that he might be exalted by the Father." . . . . But what excellence did Paul attribute to Christ, by saying that, though God by nature, he thought it not robbery—that is, knew himself—to be God? Now it is certain that never is greater violence done to the Holy Scriptures than when,

in contending with heretics, we wrest everything for the sake of victory. Yet I cannot see with what propriety this text makes against the Arians."—*Erasmus.* "Our common version . . . . seems to render nugatory, or, at least, irrelevant, a part of the Apostle's reasoning in the passage. He is enforcing the principle of Christian humility upon the Philippians . . . but how was it any proof, or example of humility, that he did not think it robbery to be equal with God."—*Professor Stuart.* "We are willing to admit the correction of the common version by our opponent, and consider the meaning of the latter clause that he 'did not eagerly retain the likeness of God.' The force of the adverb, which introduces the subsequent clause, and the general structure of the passage, appears to me to justify such an alteration."—*Rev. R. Hall.*

"For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."—Col. ii. 9.

In the third chapter of Ephesians, and nineteenth verse, the Apostle, the same Apostle who wrote this text, prays that Christians may be "*filled with all the fulness of God.*" No one would attempt to prove that Christians who are filled with the fulness of God were of the same substance with God and equal to him in power and glory. But, farther, in this Epistle, 1 chapter xix. verse, we are taught that it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell. It was the good will, the pleasure of the Father, that caused his fulness to dwell in his Son. Is it not plain from this, that essential and eternal deity does not belong to Christ. It *pleased* the Father that in him should all fulness dwell. If we therefore lay aside all prejudice, having in view these two things, "That Christians can be filled with the fulness of God;" and also, "That it pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell in Christ," we at once understand this "fulness of the Godhead" to mean the fulness of wisdom and holiness which proceeds from God. We rejoice to have such a Saviour filled with divine perfection, such a religion not wanting in any element to render humanity perfect. That this is the meaning of the passage the following quotations will show. "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Divinity, namely, of gifts, wisdom, and justice; not only that he might be furnished with this excellence for himself, but also that he might be efficacious in others."—*Melancthon.* "The sum is, that God has fully and substantially exhibited himself to us in Christ; for St. Paul contrasts this manifestation of God, which we have in Christ, with all others which ever were; for God often exhibited himself, in part, but in Christ he communicates himself wholly to us."—CALVIN. "*In Christ*, that is, the *Gospel of Christ*, all the fulness of the Deity dwells not in figures and shadows, but bodily."—*Limborch.*

"I and my Father are one."—John x. 30.

Sometimes, if not oftentimes, do false inferences confuse themselves. It is said these words teach that the Father and Christ are *one God.* You ask the Trinitarian to account, then, for the omission of the Holy Spirit, which, according to his theory, the three make one God. Thus he finds that the Father and the Son do not make one God, and they are not one person either, according to his view. Scripture easily explains itself; in this very Gospel, chapter xvii., Christ prays that the disciples may all be ONE, that they may be *one*, even as WE ARE ONE. *Archbishop Newcome* explains it thus: "To snatch my true disciples out of my hand would be to snatch them out of my Almighty Father's hand; because I and my Father are one; one in design, action, agreement, affection." There is nothing in the Gospel we feel more joy and confidence in than this, "That Christ is one with God," and that we can all be one with Christ, one with God, and one with each other; and thus realize the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. On this often quoted passage, to prove the deity of Christ, we will quote a few very important admissions by believers in the deity of Christ. "*We are one*, in respect of the preservation of these sheep."—*Bishop Pearce.* "I am intimately joined to the Father, for my cause is that of the Father, and we labour in the same work. I plead God's cause; I am the ally of God, who therefore renders to me his especial aid."—*Kuinoel.* "Now, as there are innumerable passages to be understood of consent and mutual love, I do not see how this text is of any value in confirming the opinion of the orthodox, or in restraining the pertinacity of the heretic."—*Erasmus.* "The ancients improperly used this passage to prove that Christ is of the same substance as the Father, for he does not argue concerning unity of substance, but speaks of his agreement with the Father; so that whatever is done by Christ will be confirmed by the Father's power."—*Calvin.* "Christ might mean that they are one in will, one in sentiment, one in interest. For in that sense he speaks of his people even on earth as one with God; when he prays for them, that they all may be one, 'As thou, father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.' 'I in them and thou in me, that they may be perfect in one.'"—*Bishop Sumner.* "I would expound the words of Christ independently of any construction which his embittered enemies put upon them. And in the present case it seems to me that the meaning of '*I and my Father are one*,' is simply I and my Father are united in design, and counsel, and power. So in John xvii. 20, 21, Christ prays that all who still believe in him *may be one.* May be one with the Father and with him. So also in Gal. iii. 28, Christians of different ranks and nations are said to be *one* in Christ. In the same manner, Cicero says, '*Many constitute one*, when persons are united in temper.'"—*Professor Stuart.*

THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

"Talk about essence and substance,
And no one knows what;
God either made Christ,
Or else he did not;
If he did he's a creature,
'Tis plain at first view;
If not he's a God,
And then we have *two*."

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

WAYSIDE GATHERINGS.

PRAYER.—Our prayers and God's mercy are like two buckets in a well; while the one ascends the other descends.

"TO PREACH long and loud damnation," said Selden, "is the way to be cried up. We love a man that damns us, and we run after him again to save us."

BAD LUCK is a man with his hands in his breeches pockets and a pipe in his mouth, looking on to see how it will come. Good luck is a man to meet difficulties, his sleeves rolled up and working to make it come out right.

LAST WORDS OF HUMBOLDT.—The sun shone brilliantly into the room where Humboldt died, and it is reported that his last words, addressed to his niece, were: "*Wie herrlich diese Strahlen! sie scheinen die Erde zum Himmel zu rufen!* [How grand these rays! They seem to beckon Earth to Heaven!]"

A GOOD MOTHER.—A prisoner, lately asked if he had a mother, answered: "Yes, a pious one;" and, with tears in his eyes, said, "he would not have his mother know he was in jail for 10,000 guineas." The returning instructions of maternal lips caused him to vow a return to a pure and sober life.

POPULAR PREACHING.—A Spurgeon Gem.—Mr. Spurgeon, when at Burton, said, that if the devil's cook sent him up for breakfast a grilled Unitarian and an infidel, that they were so much alike his Satanic majesty would not be able to say which was which. And we learn that his hearers enjoy these funny sayings mightily.—*Derby and Chesterfield Reporter.*

PROGRESS.—The Egyptian Hall of the Mansion House of London, the official residence of the Lord Mayor, was built by fines levied upon Jews and Dissenters, who were then looked upon as dogs and infidels. A Jew was elected Lord Mayor, and gave his banquet in that very hall: and a Nonconformist Missionary Society held a meeting in it for the advancing of missions to China, with the Lord Mayor in the chair.

CONVERTING JEWS.—The Society for the Conversion of the Jews in New York were too easily discouraged. According to our recollection their last Report announced the conversion of three Jews at an expense of 14,000 dollars, or about 5000 dollars a head, while the expense of converting a Jew in London appears to be about 7,500 dollars. The Society for the Conversion of the Jews held its annual meeting recently. The Report stated that the income of the Society for the past year had been £31,305 16s. 4d. It further stated that the number of Jews who have been christened during that period was Nineteen large ones, and One little one; but we'll say Twenty. This, according to long division, indicates, as the price of converting each Jew, the sum of £1564 5s. 9¾d. The process seems a little dear, but that's the Society's business. Mr. Punch would hint to his friends the Hebrews, that if they wish to balance the account, there are heaps of Christians who are ready to become Jews at a very considerably lower figure than £1564 5s. 9¾d. per soul.—*Punch.*

ABOUT CHILDREN.—It is a popular belief with mothers that washing young children daily in cold water makes them hardy. This is a grave mistake; the feeble circulation of blood in a child requires the aid and assistance of warmth, warm water, and warm clothing. The greatest medical man who ever lived, John Hunter, recommends three rules for the management of children, and they express the substance of a volume. He says:—"Give them plenty of milk, plenty of sleep, and plenty of flannel."

THE CRACKED COMMANDMENT.—A little girl being with her mother in a shop where there was a basket of oranges, feasted her eyes on the fruit, till yielding to the temptation to take one, she hid it under her apron and walked quickly away. Her conscience, however, troubled her, and she soon replaced it in the basket. The temptation again arising, she yielded to it again, which caused another struggle, resulting in her returning it to the basket. As she was walking sadly home with her mother, she exclaimed, "Oh, mother, I've cracked one of the commandments. I did'nt break it quite, but I'm sure I cracked it."

HEALTH PROMOTED BY FAMILY MUSIC.—Music, like paintings and statuary, refines, and elevates, and sanctifies. Song is the language of gladness, and it is the utterance of devotion. But, coming lower down, it is physically beneficial; it rouses the circulation, wakes up the bodily energies, and diffuses life and animation around. Does a lazy man ever sing? Does a milk-and-water character ever strike a stirring note? Never. Song is the outlet of mental and physical activity, and increases both by its exercises. No child has completed a religious education who has not been taught to sing the songs of Zion. No part of our religious worship is sweeter than this. In David's day it was a practice and a study.

AUNT-DINAH-HEARERS. — Last month the Rev. C. Spurgeon preached at Norwich; and the result of the two collections, so little money, for so many thousands of hearers, that we infer Mr. Spurgeon has a host of hearers, in every town he visits, as he has in London, like Old Aunt Dinah, who was a shouting coloured saint, and would sing at the top of her voice, and cry *Glory!* above all the rest. It was common at the missionary prayer-meeting of the coloured people to take up a collection while singing the hymn,

"Fly abroad, thou mighty Gospel!"

In the midst of which Aunt Dinah always threw her head back, shut her eyes, and sang away lustily *till the plate had gone by.* The sable collector observed her habit, and one night stopped when he came to her, and said very bluntly: "Look a'head, Aunt Dinah! you needn't be singing 'Fly abroad thou mighty Gospel,' if you doesn't give nothin' to make it fly!"

Four Copies of the CHRISTIAN FREEMAN will be sent, *post-free*, at 6d. per Month, or 6s. per Annum. Nine Copies, *post-free*, 1s. per month, or 12s. per Annum.

All Letters, Post Office Orders, &c., to be addressed to ROBERT SPEARS, Stockton-on-Tees.

Printed by W. ROBINSON, High-street, Stockton.